1 3 AUG 1999

Electronic *memo*

POST OFFICE

To	john.dicks___GRO___
cc	Bob Booth/ITS/POSG/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, John Meagher/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Keith K Baines/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Hard Copy To	
Hard Copy cc	
From	John G Cook/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Date	13/08/99 12:53
Subject	AI314

John,

I undertook to respond more fully on you latest analysis of AI314. Please find attached a paper describing this.

Please let me know if you want me to be involved in developing a rectification plan (as it seems unlikely we will be able to develop and agree a comprehensive document set in the timescales, even if we agreed on what was required).

John Cook

1st Floor, 20-23 Greville Street, LONDON. EC1N 8SS.
STD Phone: ___GRO___ Fax: 0171 400 4955

AI314 summary.do

Horizon Programme - Contract Team

AI 314 - THIRD PARTY PROCUREMENTS

Author: John Cook

Version: 1.0
Date: 13 August 1999

1.   INTRODUCTION

1.1.   AI314 has been an open incident since 15 June 1999. In the most recent acceptance workshops it has been discussed in some detail with Pathway. This paper confirms that POCL continue to consider that this incident is not resolved and that it should be assigned a medium severity level.

2.   REASON FOR MEDIUM CATEGORISATION

2.1.   AI314 relates to the requirement on Pathway to provide technical documentation suitable to allow POCL to procure applications from third parties. Without such documentation, and if it were not maintained, POCL would be forced to involve Pathway at the earliest stages of any new development that may operate on Horizon - even a development that was intended to be produced by the Post Office in-house resource.

2.2.   Even if Pathway co-operated fully on each occasion, this would introduce a delay in any development cycle, and would give Pathway an early view (and therefore a commercial advantage) of everything POCL are considering. In the papers that Pathway have produced in seeking to resolve this incident, they suggest that some documents that third parties may require are in fact internal to Pathway and that 3rd party access to them would be carried out by Pathway personnel under the control of a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

2.3.   Third parties may feel that they would never be able to bid with confidence against Pathway and hence Pathway would become the de facto provider of all Horizon services. Hence it is argued that POCL's commercial freedoms in developing its business would be constrained.

3.   ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

3.1.   The acceptance criteria that POCL seek to test against are those derived from requirements 469 and 470. In addition, it was agreed that in order to close AI199, relating to the boundary between OPS and TMS, POCL required that the documentation aspects of that incident (covered by acceptance criterion 869/5) should be added into AI314.

3.2.   In their latest analysis of the incident, Pathway include the statement that all these criteria cannot be considered under AI314 as they have provided documentation. However the dispute is about the status of the documents they have been provided, and whether they are fit for the required purpose.

4. PATHWAY'S REBUTTAL POINTS

4.1. Document provision

Existing documents

4.1.1. Pathway's basic argument is that they have already provided a document set, supported by a draft policy document. Pathway have cited their response to requirements 469 and 470 that they would provide the following documents:

    (a) OPS Architecture Document

    (b) OPS API Document

    (c) Counter Hardware Design Specification

    (d) TMS Architecture Document

    (e) TMS API Document

    (f) TMS Hardware Specification

4.1.2. In fact we only hold copies of documents (a), (c) and (d) above, and only (c) has been formally provided as a contract controlled document. Indeed document (d) is marked as "Company in Confidence". Documents (b) and (e) have been made available to be viewed, but POCL have not been given copies. The extent to which POCL can use these documents for 3rd party procurements is therefore entirely constrained by Pathway.

4.1.3. Furthermore, the opening of document (d) includes statements such as:

- "The development of ICL products and services is continuous and published information may not be up to date. It is important to check the current position with ICL. This document is not part of a contract or license save insofar as may be expressly agreed."

- "These documents do not attempt to fully document the Horizon solution"

- "These documents are not specific to a particular release of Horizon"

It is clear that these documents are not sufficient for some-one to develop an application that integrates with Horizon, and that there is a danger of them becoming out of step as Horizon develops,

4.1.4. In their analysis of the AI, Pathway have cited the Asset Register as fulfilling the purpose of document (f). Again this document is not yet fully agreed (it was only provided in late July 1999) and is at a different level to document (c) for example - it is not a specification, merely an Asset Register.

Policy document

4.1.5. The policy document (ICL Pathway External Applications Procurement Policy) has been commented on separately, but is still in draft and Pathway have agreed to amend it to take on board some of POCL's comments. However the overall concern is that it assumes the active participation of Pathway from the earliest stages in any new development, and therefore would make a fair competition very difficult to achieve.

Further documentation

4.1.6. Pathway have pointed out that the document set for any specific development will almost always require other documentation depending on the nature of the application. POCL accepts that other documentation may be needed, but do not feel that what has been provided is fit for the purpose stated in the requirements. We have already suggested that Pathway could at least provide a document structure, a quality plan for each document and timescale for the production of the full set.

4.1.7. In discussion we cited examples of other information we would expect a third party to require to develop an application. Pathway in part asserted that the information we seek is part of EPOSS and therefore beyond the scope of the requirements. The fallacy here is that the requirements were written before the supplier's architecture was known and that requirements ascribed to the POCL Infrastructure, Pathway are delivering as part of the EPOSS service. (Examples are attached at annex A).

5. MANAGING 3RD PARTY PROCUREMENTS

5.1. In their response to AI314 Pathway have cited clause 211 as requiring POCL to approach Pathway with new opportunities as part of the Partnership intentions.

5.2. POCL contend that this clause is only an indication of a desire to establish such a relationship, but does not commit POCL to always using Pathway. The purpose of the relevant requirements is to protect POCL's commercial freedoms if it proves impossible to establish such a relationship in all areas.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. POCL remains of the view that the document set currently provided by Pathway to satisfy requirements 469 and 470 do not meet the requirements. The restrictions this could place on POCL's commercial freedoms are significant. AI314 remains unresolved and is of medium severity.

ANNEX A

Examples of TMS/OPS requirements that an third party supplier would need to comprehend.

Requirement 478 provides for TMS to perform a range of tasks, including for example timed data file collection and delivery, validation of data files, merging of data files etc.	A supplier will need to know how to invoke these facilities in order to collate and transfer the data relating to the application they are developing
Solution 472 (re OPS audit trail) includes:	
"Pathway's solution for the OPS is based on a set of counter applications running on processors at every counter position. The counter applications all operate under Riposte, a suite of software which provides mechanisms for ensuring data security and integrity within the OPS and across the network to TMS.	Note that it is TMS and OPS that provide the facilities to applications - it is how applications interact to use these facilities that needs documenting
All data captured at a post office counter either as part of a counter transaction or as an administration function (user log-on, teller balance) will form part of a unique transaction which is given a unique reference number by Riposte. The format of this journal entry will vary according to the transaction type.	Note that log-ons, system events and application data is journalled to OPS
Retrieval of data using a particular key field will retrieve all entries containing that field and logically determine the overall state of the transaction data. A complete audit trail of all transactions and other significant events is maintained within the post office systems and is automatically available for analysis by both audit access facilities and value added services which are linked to TMS.	Note that Pathway explicitly acknowledge that value added services will need to be able to extract information from the journal. They need to document how.

Solution 473	
Authentication of all users logging on to the OPS in the post office is undertaken by the OPS operating system. Full access control and password management facilities are provided. The OPS uses this information to ensure that only authorised staff are allowed access to applications, and then only to those applications for which they have permission.	Note that OPS provides the access control and the mapping of applications to users. Again, an application needs to know how to drive these facilities.
A facility which enables users to securely suspend their current session and then to resume the session is provided as part of the overall OPS functionality. The suspend function is invoked by the user using a specific keystroke (e.g. Control + Key) and may be performed at any time providing that there is no counter transaction in progress, or where the transaction integrity may be compromised by allowing a suspension (e.g. part way through a smart card transaction). The suspended session may be resumed by the user entering his password.	Again, OPS is provided facilities that underpin the operation of an application service. How OPS interacts with the application must be documented.